EVALUATION OF INTERACTION ASSOCIATES' WORK WITH THE STUDENTS CHANNEL

IPT CALL CENTER-

+	D
• Had resources	• Wish there had been an up front process for training so that we'd know the tools we'd be using
• Saw how to facilitate effective meetings	• At times, there were too many people from IA
• Meeting notes to participants after meetings	• Level of skills differed within IA

• Skills brought to table–
   • Very interactive
   • If something was going on, people's opinions & concerns were encouraged to be expressed
	• It would have been helpful to have more timely notification when IA couldn't make a meeting. (However, when IA couldn't be there, they made sure the materials were there.

• Used a lot of the skills learned after the IPT, e.g. when dealing with the employee satisfaction survey. Skills used included–
   • Talking about next meeting at previous meeting
   • Gave staff a chance to apply the skills
   • Got input from staff so they owned the outcomes
   • Using 2 colors of markers
	• There was some confusion of IA's role; so, Accenture felt that IA was stepping on their toes at times. They said that IA should be facilitating and not giving input on the content and process.

• IA was an equalizer–
   • A third party that came without baggage & kept that role throughout
   • So, when we got stuck, IA helped us get through
	• The IPT took much more participant time than was stated in the beginning

• Process map was a gift–
   • It helped us see up front how much time we needed on different subjects & when we needed to involve people
   • It helped set ourselves up for success
	• Need to be realistic about level of involvement

• People always came to meetings prepared because they knew that the first thing we'd do is go over the "Next Steps" from the last meeting. This kept us on track.	
• Well organized	
• Planning team met before the core team met. It took a lot of time, but it was worth it.	
• Had tools available at every meeting, including sub-team meetings–flip charts, desired outcomes, markers, agenda,…	
• There was brevity–because we knew what the outcomes of a meeting were and focused on those and achieved them.	
• Launch was most memorable. We've never invited people to the table in the beginning. Operating Partners were engaged throughout, from the first day. That was ground-breaking.	
• Stakeholder analysis in the beginning.	
• Core team was carefully picked	
• There was full participation at Core Team meetings. People wanted to participate.	

EVALUATION OF INTERACTION ASSOCIATES' WORK WITH THE STUDENTS CHANNEL

EVALUATION OF INTERACTION ASSOCIATES' WORK WITH THE STUDENTS CHANNEL

ACCENTURE, MARY K, AND JENNIFER-

+	D
• When started with the E-Servicing launch, IA helped to get people agreeing on objectives and helped to get buy-in. Then, when the tactical teams needed to do the work, IA wasn't needed because there was not the group need for consensus, and stakeholders who were needed were on the sub-teams.	• Confusion because leadership thought that what was happening in one IPT was happening in others
• Process map was a helpful document. Once that was in place, we could go off and do the work.	• With E-servicing and Operating Partners, leadership didn't sit with Sybil, Accenture, and IA at the outset which led to bumps/disconnects
• Noticed a big difference when IA came in on CRM. IA helped diffuse Accenture's tendency to know where it needed to go and to slow down to get people on board	• IA and Accenture had different expectations about time–IA, go slow to go fast; Accenture wants to get business results, so don't let planning get in the way; so, client wasn't clear that it was o.k. to go slower
• Good working relationship between IA and Accenture on the Student Aid Awareness IPT[2]. Learned a lot from IA. Worked through challenges. End result was that the team learned a lot, and they have tools and skills they can take with them. IA provided great direction, fluid transition, and an added step of an action plan that helped. IA also helped to manage diverse views that led to a common solution.	• IA is perceived as slow folk & thorn or pain in Accenture's side
	• There was a disconnect between IA & Accenture, and the impact was felt by the client.
	• Accenture and IA's roles needed to be more clearly defined in the beginning of the Student Aid Awareness IPT[2]
	• Need to build in on-going communication and debriefs between SFA, Accenture, and IA.
	• Need more guidance up front from SFA on how much to get people involved from the beginning.

EVALUATION OF INTERACTION ASSOCIATES' WORK WITH THE STUDENTS CHANNEL

STUDENT AID AWARENESS IPT[1]-

+	D
• Involvement of other parts of the department when setting up initial sessions was great	• People leading teams were over-committed and so were participants
• When Linda was taken out, she sat down with Adara, her replacement, and got her up to speed	• When Linda was taken out of the process, there had been some bonding; so, people could feel the shift
• The 4 projects led to planting the seed for SAAIPT[2]	• Someone thought the purpose of the IPT was supposed to be to chart a course for SAA but that it evolved into 4 projects.
• People who were there were committed to the process and to accomplishing what they set out to do.	• Could have been clearer in the charter about whether the Profile sub-group was to gather data themselves or that they would not do all the research.
• There was minimal drop-out	• Student intern worked out at first, but we couldn't devote enough time to her and couldn't give her work. She also came in late in the IPT process.
• Training up front with some of processes was very helpful and led to people going back over it and using some of the terminology with the sub-teams. They rotated leading meetings to learn how to facilitate and felt more cohesive as a group. There were good working meetings in which we accomplished a lot.	• At the mid-course presentation to Students Channel management, not enough management was there.
• Enthusiasm of people carried them. People initiated things and followed through. People volunteered on Saturdays and had a real team effort.	• The process works well for some things, but need a more streamlined process for Quick Hits.
• In a short amount of time, we did networking and gained entrance into other parts of the department. We were able to develop other relationships and show that we're not trying to take them over. From the strides made, people will pause now and invite us into things. We made an impact on Ed people and will be included in the future.	
• It really helped to look at stakeholders in the beginning and to do the initial approaches with them that we did.	
• We participated in all 3 sites side-by-side.	
• I learned that it is an iterative process.	
• Originally there was resistance to team chartering, process mapping, and +/Δ, but now it has become part of the culture.	
• Members were highly committed in spite of adding this on to their other work. If you put people on a task about which they are enthusiastic, it pays off. You have to enroll them from their perspective in the beginning.	